

REMARKS

The Office Action of October 5, 2006 was received and reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for reviewing the application.

Claims 1-45 were pending prior to the instant amendment for consideration. By this amendment, claims 3 and 6 have been amended to further complete the scope to which Applicants are entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-45 remain pending for consideration, of which claims 1, 3, 6, 9, and 32-24 are independent.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Ernstoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,090,219 – hereafter Ernstoff), Ohwada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,750,813 – hereafter Ohwada), and Hata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,439,837 – hereafter Hata). Further, claims 10-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, and Hata, as applied to claims 3 and 9 above, and further in view of McDowall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,262 – hereafter McDowall). Still further, claims 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,327,229 – hereafter Konno). Still yet further, claims 35-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno, as applied to claims 32-34 above, and further in view of McDowall.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 9, Applicants believe that the Examiner has failed to address all of the claim limitations. For instance, claims 1 and 9 each recite, *inter alia*, the features of an n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit which compresses an original video signal by $1/(3n)$ (n is an integer of 2 or more) times in a time axis direction, and the n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit comprises a thin film transistor over the same substrate as an active matrix circuit. With respect to independent claims 3 and 6, amended claims 3 and 6 now recite, *inter alia*, the features of “an n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit for receiving an original video signal and compressing the original video signal by $1/(3n)$ times in a time axis direction, ... wherein said n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit comprises a thin film transistor over said substrate” as a display section. (See specification, FIG. 4 and page 24, line 17 to page 25, line 11.) Given the features of an n-speed field sequential color signal generation

circuit being formed over the same substrate as the display section with a thin film transistor, the number of electrical parts can be reduced, so that manufacturing costs can be reduced. Further, the amount of data processing done by any external circuit outside the display substrate can also be reduced.

Applicants believe that AAPA, Ernstoff, Ohwada, and Hata fail to teach or suggest an n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit. Furthermore, Ohwada only teaches a timing generating circuit on a glass substrate together with the TFTs, however, Ohwada's timing generating circuit is for generating a timing signal and not for compressing a video signal as presently claimed. Therefore, Ohwada does not teach or suggest an n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit formed over the same substrate as a display section as presently claimed.

In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, and Hata is respectfully requested.

McDowall does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, and Hata mentioned above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 9 are allowable as discussed previously. Further, any claim that depends from an allowable claim is allowable as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claims 10-31 likewise be removed.

In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, and Hata, as applied to claims 3 and 9 above, and further in view of McDowall is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 32-34, Applicants believe that the Examiner has failed to address all of the claim limitations. For instance, claims 32-34 each recite, *inter alia*, the features of an n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit which compresses an original video signal by $1/(3n)$ (n is an integer of 2 or more) times in a time axis direction, and the n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit comprises a thin film transistor over the same substrate as an active matrix circuit. Therefore, Applicants believe that the combination of AAPA, Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno fails to teach or suggest an n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit formed over the same

substrate as an active matrix circuit as similarly argued above regarding claims 1 and 9.


In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, McDowall does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno mentioned above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 32-34 are allowable as discussed previously. Further, any claim that depends from an allowable claim is allowable as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claims 35-45 likewise be removed.

In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 35-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno, as applied to claims 32-34 above, and further in view of McDowall is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-45 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey L. Costellia
Registration No. 35,483

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000